The member concluded by suggesting that, until women attained a position of equality with men, special privileges should, of necessity, be accorded to them. Qualified women should not be kept out of the public life of the country by reason of their sex.

DEWAN'S REPLY: Mrs. Anna Chandy. I shall convey to Her Highness the Maha Rani Regent with the greatest pleasure the sentiments of loyalty and gratitude which you, on behalf of yourself and the other lady members of this Assembly, gave expression to. I may also say how glad I am to be able to say that the fear that you expressed at the beginning of your speech that perhaps the representations made by women members of this House may be wanting in form and the request that I should look upon your performance with a lenient eye were both unnecessary. As a matter of fact, I should like to express my sincere opinion that your representation has been one of the best and most useful representation and one of the most moderate in the sense that it does not refuse to look at the other side of things but impartially considers both sides.

With regard to the actual representation that you have made, you know that the question of women accused taken to Police Stations and of proper accommodation being made for them in Police lock-ups, has been under the consideration of Government for some time. But as you yourself concede, it is not possible for the Government to do all that is necessary all at once. Government can only proceed step by step in that direction. But you have been fair enough not to stand upon the extreme step at each of your prayers, but you have asked only for the minimum which it is possible for the Government to do.

In regard to these representations of yours, I shall refer them to the High Court, the District Magistrates and the other authorities concerned. Government will be prepared to do all that they can in furtherance of your representation.

I congratulate you again on the way in which you have discharged your duty as the first woman member to make a representation before the Assembly.

22. Hardships of litigants.

MR. NAGENDRA NAIKAN RAMANATHA NAIKAN (*Trading classes, Kayankulam*) who made his representation in Malayalam, said that the Munsiffs and Judges were devoting a great deal of their time to matters relating to execution of decrees and office work and that they were giving little time to the actual disposal of cases. It caused delay in the disposal of cases and consequent hardships to the public. The presiding officers of courts should be freed from work of that kind by the appointment, in each court, of a separate officer with duties and powers similar to those of the Registrar of the High Court.

It was very necessary to revive the old practice of returning the account books produced in courts by merchants immediately when

copies were produced, in order to make it possible for the applications for the return of account books being exempted from court fees.

DEWAN'S REPLY : മുൻസിഫന്മാർ നടത്തുന്ന മറുജോലികൾ നടത്തുന്നതക്കുവണ്ണം മുൻസിഫ് കോടതികളിൽ, ഹൈക്കോടതിയിലെ രജിസ്ട്രാരെപ്പോലെ, ഒരുദ്യോഗസ്ഥനെ നിയമിക്കണമെന്നു നിങ്ങൾ പറഞ്ഞു. നിങ്ങൾ പറഞ്ഞതരത്തിൽതന്നെ ഒരുദ്യോഗസ്ഥനെ നിയമിക്കാൻ പ്രയാസമാണ്. എങ്കിലും മുൻസിഫിന്റെ ഏതാനും ജോലികൾ ഇങ്ങനെനടത്താം. ഈവിഷയത്തെ സംബന്ധിച്ചു ലാസ്ഡിലേസ് കമ്മീഷണരോട് ആലോചിച്ചു് വേണ്ടതുചെയ്യാം.

കണക്കുപുസ്തകം തിരുമ്പി കൊടുക്കുന്ന സംഗതിയെപ്പറ്റി നിങ്ങൾ പറഞ്ഞു. അതു് ഹൈക്കോടതിയിലേക്ക് റഫർചെയ്തിരിക്കയാണ്. ഹൈക്കോടതി അതിനെപ്പറ്റി ആലോചനനടത്തിവരുന്നു. അവരുടെ അഭിപ്രായം വന്നശേഷം അതിനെപ്പറ്റി ആലോചിക്കാം.

[Your proposal to have in every Munsiff's Court an officer with powers imilar to those of the Registrar in the High Court, though not practicable to the extent suggested, will be referred to the Law's Delays Commissioner. The question of return of account books produced in courts has been referred to the High Court and is under consideration by them. Government will deal with the matter after getting the reply of the High Court.]

23. Insolvency Regulation.

Mr. BHAGHAVATI PERUMAL CHETTIYAR (*Trading Classes, Nagercoil*) who spoke in Tamil, dweltabout the necessity for the amendment of the Insolvency Regulation. The Insolvency Regulation was necessary only in places where there was much trade; it was not at all necessary in a State like Travancore where agriculture was the mainstay of the people. The traders of the country did not apply to the Government for the enactment of the Regulation; nor did they want a modification of the old practice. In the case of a banker who had run away evading his creditors, the High Court expressed the opinion that there must be an Insolvency Regulation to prevent a recurrence of such happenings and pursuant to that opinion the Regulation was enacted.

The Regulation was passed on the model of the Insolvency Regulation of British India more than 25 years ago. In British India there were two Acts, one for the Presidency towns and the other for the Provinces. The latter Act was taken as the basis for the Travancore Regulation. Even at the time when those Acts were introduced in British India, some defects were found and attempts were being made year after year to rectify them. But no amendment to the Travancore Regulation had been introduced as yet, even though 25 years had passed since its enactment.